

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 10, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 21 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Aoki et al. '389. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 10, 14 and 18 to state that the sensor region is provided inside a sealing material provided over the first substrate. Applicants respectfully submit that such a feature is not disclosed or suggested by Aoki. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over this reference, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 11, 15 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. in view of Helms, and rejects Claims 12, 16 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. in view of "Applicant's Prior Art Disclosure." These rejections are also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568